

## REMARKS

The Office Action of August 4, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

The present Amendment cancels independent claim 23. It also corrects an informality in claim 18.

The Office Action rejects all of the claims for obviousness on the basis of Freivald et al in view of Jellum et al. For the sake of convenient discussion, these references will hereafter be called simply "Freivald" and "Jellum." It is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed below.

Independent claim 7 recites that a notification-receiver's address holding means includes "means for holding at least one keyword...". Claim 7 also provides that a "differential information piece" represents differences between old and new web page data, and that an updated data extracting means includes "means for removing [the] differential information piece from the updated data when the differential information piece does not include the held keyword."

At the middle of page 4, the Office Action acknowledges that Freivald does not disclose these features. The Office Action then turns to Jellum, and concludes that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teachings of Jellum into Freivald's system in order to provide precise notification of a changed document. Not surprisingly, Applicants respectfully disagree with this conclusion.

The operation of Freivald's system is summarized in the abstract of the reference. A web page is divided into sections and a checksum is generated for each section and stored. During a subsequent visit to the web page, new checksums are generated. If the old checksum does not match the new checksum in a section of interest to a user, the user is notified that a change has occurred.

Jellum's technique for detecting changes is considerably different. Jellum detects changes by comparing an old XML file to a new XML file (see column 9, lines 12-16).


It is respectfully submitted that an ordinarily skilled person who wanted to improve Freivald's system in some way would not have been interested in Jellum's keywords. The reason is that the ordinarily skilled person would likely think that any information about a keyword, in a section of interest to a user of Freivald's arrangement, would not be preserved when the section of interest is converted to a checksum in accordance with the Freivald reference. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Jellum would not have led an ordinarily skilled person to modify Freivald so as to achieve the invention defined by independent claim 7.

Independent claim 18 is similar to claim 7, except that it is a method claim instead of an apparatus claim. It is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by claim 18 is patentable over the references for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 7.

Since the remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above and recite additional limitations to further define the invention, they are patentable along with their independent claims and need not be further discussed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood  
Registration No. 28,134  
Customer number 23995  
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.  
Suite 500  
1101 14<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 326-0222 (telephone)  
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng